



## THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO **MANAGER'S REPORT**

DATE ISSUED: December 6, 2000

REPORT NO. 00-268

ATTENTION: Honorable Mayor and City Council,  
Docket of December 12, 2000

SUBJECT: Short Term Transitional Housing for Homeless Families

### SUMMARY

Issue - Should the City Council authorize a condemnation action to acquire property rights for Short Term Transitional Housing for Homeless Families Project?

Manager's recommendation - Authorize the condemnation action to obtain the necessary property rights.

Other Recommendations - None

Fiscal Impact - The estimated costs of condemnation include: Value of the property rights to be acquired: Land and Improvements; \$1,980,000, relocation, title, litigation and miscellaneous expenses \$1,520,000; Total \$3,500,000. Funds for the condemnation are available in Fund No. 10249 for Short Term Transitional Housing for Homeless Families.

Environmental Impact - This action is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Ordinance (CEQA) pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15061 (b) (3). This determination is predicated on Section 15004 of the Guidelines which provides direction to lead agencies on the appropriate timing for environmental review. The use of this property will require further review under the provisions of CEQA.

### BACKGROUND

On October 11, 2000, the Land Use and Housing Committee approved the acquisition of the Days Inn Motel located at 1449 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue for use as a year-round short term transitional housing for homeless families. This site was chosen after an extensive property search by the Real Estate Assets Department and the Centre City Development Corporation. Due to the tight real estate

market and the specific facility size requirements, locating an appropriate facility has taken more than a year. On June 7, 2000, the Real Estate Assets Department presented the Land Use and Housing Committee with sixteen different sites, each were investigated and found to be either too expensive or did not meet other minimum standards for the project.

A final offer for the necessary property rights has been made to the property owner. The offer has not been accepted.. Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds will used for acquisition which specifically precludes the City from paying above than the appraised value. While the Real Estate Assets Department will continue to negotiate with the owner, condemnation authorization is requested to ensure possession of the property.

Eminent Domain Law requires that any person subject to condemnation proceedings be given the opportunity to speak and be heard regarding the following questions to which the Council must address itself.

1. Does the public interest and necessity require the proposed project?

Yes. The acquisition of this property is necessary to assure homeless families have shelter while critical supportive services are provided and permanent housing options are identified for them. The project will shelter 150 family members for 60-90 days.

This acquisition also contributes toward meeting the City's homeless shelter needs as identified in HUD's and the City's Consolidated Plan.

2. Is the proposed project planned or located in the manner that will be most compatible with the greatest public good and least private injury?

Yes. The property is located in hotel/residential district. There is currently construction of new residential multi-family homes in the area. The planned rehabilitation of this facility would enable the property to blend in with other development presently underway. Because only families with children will be housed there, the use is compatible with the neighborhood.

3. Is the property sought to be acquired necessary for the project?

Yes. Acquisition of this property is necessary because after a year-long, comprehensive property search by the Real Estate Assets Department and the Centre City Development Corporation for a facility to house the short term transitional homeless families, this was the only property that both meets the minimum facility requirements of the project and is within the available acquisition and rehabilitation budget. Twenty one different property options were

considered and investigated. In addition, a temporary sprung structure option was also explored.

ALTERNATIVE

Do not condemn for the necessary property rights, and require that the project be delayed and/or re-evaluated.

Respectfully submitted,

---

William T. Griffith  
Real Estate Assets Director

---

Approved: George I. Loveland  
Assistant City Manager

GRIFFITH/RAG